

Meeting Description: Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting

Date: December 2, 2004

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Location: Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 10th Floor, Conference Room

I. Approval of Meeting Minutes

II. Geographic Framework Program

A. Framework Activities Program

Everett Root, Center for Geographic Information (CGI), reported that CGI has completed all of the edits and started making the ACT 51 maps. We have started going through the Qualified Voter Files (QVF) and adding the roads and streets that have been submitted. The staff are starting to go into the Framework file by county. Those are filed away by City and Township then organized by County. Staff are going through and putting those in, along with private roads, which do not go through the ACT 51 process. CGI has started to add the school district boundaries from the updates that we have received from this past springs' boundary review process. All the editing went into a Statewide Geo database. Starting to add the features to match up with those in Framework that we have edited from the geo database. When Version 5 comes out the school districts will have significant updates. The other thing is the voter precinct. In the process of matching the 2000 Tiger voter precinct to Framework and if there are any changes from 2000 up to 2004, those will be updated. Once that base is set, any future changes will be updated into Framework. Roads, Precincts and School Districts are the focus right now.

Rob (CGI) with the road ACT 51, any boundary and annexations of city and villages will be added. It is a constant process. Would you know how many cities, counties have submitted information for the QVF?

Everett (CGI) all of them. Anyone who submits a new street has to submit that to QVF. Any community who has had a subdivision built has sent that in as well.

Rob (CGI) Barry County has sent in some changes.

Rosemary Anger (Barry County) we have sent 600 or 700 pages of changes to individual segments.

Rob (CGI) Any questions on that? Has anyone had trouble with the information posted on the web site?

Rosemary (Barry) When I went in to get the data dictionary from Version 4, the link was broken.

Rob (CGI) We will check into that. Any other questions, issues related to some of the work that we are doing?

B. Digital Ortho Update

Rob (CGI) There has been some digital ortho discussions and activities on a number of fronts. Ann Burns, Southeast Michigan Council of Government (SEMCOG), Not much has changed in the last month. Still negotiating a contract with Earthdata. We are spending a lot of time on Data sharing agreements. We are trying to put together one agreement that all of the partners can agree on. So, you can imagine how much work that is. Our Quality Control committee has been formed and they are putting together standards. Each of the seven counties is responsible for QC (Quality Control) of their own imagery. So, we want to have a standard for everyone to work on the same face when they are doing QC.

Rob (CGI) Just another note on that, I have discussed some of the QAQC (Quality Assurance and Quality Control) issues with constant monitor issues and printer issues and if you need anymore information on that, I can help put you in touch with someone. Are there any more questions on the SEMCOG project because some of you are new to the meeting. You may not be aware that Southeast Michigan is flying seven counties.

Joyce Newell, Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), asked if there is any information on the Web site about that or will you have soon?

Ann Burns (SEMCOG), we are waiting until we have a signed contract before we put anything else new out there. We have it on the development site. We just haven't put it on production yet. So, hopefully after the 1st of the year, it will be out.

Rob (CGI) from the State's perspective, we have been working on a number of fronts.

Obviously we have been working on developing the funding model to work with statewide plan of imagery that would cover the bulk of the needs. Then potentially it will be an opportunity to partner with local counties or regions that were interested and we have some contributions to that. In addition to that there are some recent developments with MSU regarding the NAIP (National Agricultural Inventory Program), the farm services and others who are working with crop areas. They are flying that and I believe the standard is 2 meters. The opportunity is to partner with them. I know the NRCS (National Resource Conservation Services) is partnering this go round. They want to partner with them to increase the accuracy to a 1-meter product. MSU (Michigan State University) land use leadership folks are working on part of that program to see if they can acquire some support for the NAIP product. It would be a 2005 summer flight. It would be a statewide flight. There has been some interest at the State level. They are considering if this is the product they need. They are looking at about \$400,000. MDEQ (Michigan Department of Environmental Quality) has suggested that they would put some money toward this. Some of the other departments are still reviewing what they want to do or not. I think by the end of the year there should be some kind of plan in place. The program would be administered at the Federal level, but it would be public domain information. It would be made available through all the channels we use now. The USGS (United States Geological Survey), has come on board with suggesting that they would be interested in a National map program, helping other areas of the state pump money to our office, we would in turn distribute that to various partnerships around the state. This would be for not only developing imagery, but ways to get at that imagery and some other components. Certainly their focus is in urban areas right now, with the Homeland Security focus, the Southeast Michigan, the Grand Rapids, the Lansing and the Flint areas. That's where their priorities are right now. We are still working out the details of what that might mean.

SEMCOG is the 1st potential partnership. They have said that they would like to come on board, but those details have yet to be worked out. The NAIP is not something that the USGS is interested in, except if you are in the Western part of the United States where there are no trees, but that is something that other Federal Agencies are interested in. MDOT and MDNR have been a part of discussions and a few other departments are interested. It is a fairly reasonable, cheap product. Not a lot of money for a statewide product. We are still looking at the business cases, the return of the investment, this sort of thing. The idea would be to have multiple coverage in the same year in your area. Their standard product, they usually use natural color, but the option is there to go to CIR (color infrared) they have a program and the potential is to use digital acquisition methods, but it is not a guarantee. Under certain circumstances, you could put another sensor on without a lot of additional cost to doing that.

But there are some extra cost involved if you are needing additional services or products. So, there would have to be an agreement on a product with this program. So, if it were natural color or CIR, it would have to be approved by all parties.

Ann (SEMCOG) so, what is their model? Is the State or the Feds, looking for partners?

Rob (CGI) they will fly about 45% to 50% of the State, if there are no partners, the NRCS is coming on board anyway. My understanding is that it will be 2 meter. If no partners come on board, that's their standard product. They will fly that anyway.

Everett (CGI) Nebraska and Minnesota partnered. They got their data. It is available on the their web site.

Bill Enslin, Michigan State University (MSU) MSU had signed an agreement with partners, so it is good to go. The specifics are still not worked out. It definitely will be 1 meter. But whether it will be color or CIR, those specifics have not been worked out.

Rob (CGI) so, they have the money now?

Bill (MSU), they have signed an agreement meaning they're going to get the money, a non-binding agreement.

Joyce Newell (MDOT), my understanding is that they actually have until December to get the money in due to binding.

Bill (MSU) yes, it's a pretty strong agreement.

David Slayton (MDEQ), will that be the entire State?

Bill (MSU), yes, that would be the entire state.

David (MDEQ), is the State going to put up money for that? Is this going to happen without State money? DEQ said they would commit to that. I am just wandering how that works?

Bill (MSU), no, I don't think so. It's just that because of the timing of when the commitments and letters had to be in and stuff like that, that there was a strong enough interest from Michigan to continue that with discussion going on. I have no roll or part in that. This is just what I have heard that there is some money with the State that would partner with that.

Joyce (MDOT), as of Monday, they were still looking for money.

Rob (CGI), there are a few more departments to be heard from. So, probably within the next few weeks there will be some sort of decision exactly on who, what and how much and that kind of thing. It's on somewhat of a fast tract. Whatever comes out of that will certainly become available to all you folks if that's something you are interested in. I know the land use land cover process is a big part of the driving application for that. Are there other ortho or imagery discussion items?

Jeroen Wagendorp, Grand Valley State University (GVSU), the delivery of the Ortho product in Ottawa county has been delayed until January, because they were getting a combined LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging System), Ortho light that needs to be finished before the Ortho can be done. I think that is a significant delay because you are looking at October and now it's January.

Rob (CGI), will that particular product be available for purchase? Is that how that works, if you are interested in that particular area of the State?

Jeroen (GVSU), you are dealing with a whole new slate of Commissioners in a lot of counties, so I don't know.

Rob (CGI), who is the lead person to talk with over there?

Jeroen (GVSU), well, it would be Aaron Bolts. But the extent of which they will share, I don't know. It is the six inch grey scale.

Ann (SEMCOG), can you think of another three county effort going in with the State?

Everett (CGI), I believe that Saginaw, Bay and Midland Counties are partnering. Tri County Planning had one too. I believe it was on their Web site.

Rob (CGI), at one time, we were going to try to keep up with that and put that type of information on the web site, but haven't quite achieved that. We can at least communicate through here and let folks know.

III. MDNR Projects and Activities

Sherm Hollander, Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), there is nothing new to report. Those projects that I have talked about in the past are moving along.

IV. MDOT Projects and Activities

Joyce Newell, Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), we are still in the process of collecting AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic) information for the Federal aid system. We have just received files from SEMCOG as of today. We have two other regions working on it and if that goes well, we will send it out to the rest of the regions. That is necessary for our HPMS (Highway Performance Monitoring System) for reporting on Federal Highways on the roadway conditions. It will also probably be used as a starting point for asset management on pavement management because we don't want people to look at the pavement condition when determining where to send money. If there are not that many cars on the road, it really is not all that cost effective to fix the road, when there is another road just as bad, but has ten times as many cars on the road. We felt we need something in the way of traffic data to go along with pavement management.

Rob (CGI) Do you have any idea if this will go to the Federal Aid roads at this time.

Joyce (MDOT) The Federal aid roads is what we are reflecting at this time. If that goes smoothly, and even if that doesn't go, we would try to work or smooth it out. We would get guesses on what the traffic is in the Federal Aid system. For the down system, the less accurate the guesses will be and with the less traffic you have there too, so the less impact you would have on the down time. Hopefully in the Federal Aid system, a lot of them would be based on count data and actual knowledge of the area.

David Slayton (MDEQ), I believe that we are going to have an agreement with CGI or have already done so. John Esch (MDEQ) says we are going to proceed with that project in lieu of a water bureau project. The underground storage tanks are ready to be put up there. I think it is going to be an interactive application. We just got our ESRI (Environmental Systems Research Institute) maintenance agreement signed with all of our updates. We are going to try and figure out where all of the licenses are.

Mark Larrow (Monroe County) is that licensing for Web site?

David (MDEQ) yes, for Website, desktop, and ArcMap. There are a few IMS things and extensions. They are all on the DEQ on desktops or servers.

Rob (CGI), we have talked with ESRI about the potential for enterprise licensing. Similar to what the Federal Agencies are working on. I haven't had time to pursue it, but they brought it up as a potential. It would certainly clean up some of that.

IV. MSP Projects and Activities

A. Michigan Homeland Security GIS Advisory Committee

Rob (CGI) Eric Nishan isn't here to report. This month we are meeting with Captain John Ort, the Homeland Security Advisory Chair to the Governor and we will be working on the budget for the GIS components that will go into the Homeland Securities budget for this coming year. The discussions have been very positive. There is a recognition that GIS is a critical component to an effective Homeland Security emergency operations plan. The involvement of

the local emergency operation centers and the local GIS offices is going to be a centerpiece to this plan and as the local and regional GIS agencies have voiced their desire to be integrated into that process, I think that's what you are going to see coming out of this. All of us are going to take a step up to the next level on how we work together. There will be some dollars associated with that. Probably by next month, we should know more about how that is going. We will keep you posted.

VII. MDCH Projects and Activities

Mike Hass, Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH), we are geocoding the 302 sites (hazardous product storage locations). That's for our Toxicology folks. I'll be happy to bend whatever restrictions someone places on me to make it available.

Jeroen (GVSU), are there a number of people or groups collecting this potential hot spots data?

Mike (MDCH), My understanding is that they have to report that they are there and there's a chance that this location may exist somewhere, but can't be release for whatever Homeland Security restrictions. They do not want to consolidate that information where it is easily accessible, our toxicologist need that information. Local Health departments typically keep track of that kind of thing.

Bruce (DDTI), who is the lead agency on that? Is it Act 302?

Mike (MDCH) MDEQ is lead, but our chemical terrorism, toxicology folks interested in that. The pollution incident, prevention plan, PIPP plan, secondary containment, storage tank division, these people are interested.

Jeroen (GVSU), The PIPP Plan (Pollution Incident Prevention Plan) used to be maintained locally. When it was first started, it was maintained by local contractors. They followed everything that could spill. It might make sense to follow that through to see if it is in one central location.

Mike (MDCH), There is secondary containment regulations out there for storage of all this kind of stuff.

Rob (CGI), who would be in this kind of group?

Dave (MDEQ), in the storage tank people in my division, they may have a list, but it may be more petroleum storage tanks. It would probably not be the kind of things that you are talking about being a potential hazard.

Jeroen (GVSU), there have been different departments who have worked in these areas.

Rosemary (Barry County) I remember mapping an EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) project. That was 10 years ago.

Rob (CGI), One of the things the Homeland GIS Group has been working on in conjunction with some of the other work that SEMCOG has done, is what are these minimum standards and if we are communicating what we are doing, at least folks will have a repository to check against. Hopefully that will help us in the future. One of the challenges that became apparent when Eric Swanson (CGI) was presenting to the Homeland Security Group, and it became real apparent that some folks were collecting information and sending it to other locations. And it wasn't coming back into the State it was going to the Federal Government and wasn't being used locally by some of these programs. So, that became apparent in these discussions that we need better communication between some of these various Homeland Security initiatives.

VIII. MSI Projects and Activities

Charles Bender, Michigan State Industries (MSI), We've only got a few days left on a previous group of right of way counties that Corey Johnson (MDOT) had sent us. Yesterday, we received Wayne County. We are breaking that down for two or three individuals to work with.

Hopefully in a week or two we should have that finished as well. We are waiting on some feedback from Lydia at fisheries pertaining to the last set of Lakes we sent to them. We are suppose to have another group of lakes sent in after they have finished with the first group that we provided them with.

IX. CGI Projects and Activities

Rob (CGI), We are working on potential staffing positions. We have had several move to other state government departments. We will be having some meetings regarding different project and that issue. Hopefully within a month, we will have some positions out there. Let folks know.

X. MSU Remote Sensing and GIS Research and Outreach Services Projects and Activities

Bill Enslin (MSU), Nothing from MSU, but Steve Aichele (United States Geological Survey) asked me to remind the group and get it on the minutes that the IMAGIN (Improving Michigan's Access to Geographic Information) Forum Conference which is May 2nd – 4th, 2005, at the Hyatt Regency in Dearborn, MI. They are also having a series of workshops for addressing. They are having the first one in Traverse City on December 7, 2004. They are going to have several of these around the State. There will be one concurrent with the conference as well. That was the other item he wanted me to mention.

Rob (CGI), Everett Root (CGI) will be speaking at one of the luncheons. He will be talking about some of the activities relating to addressing at the State level and some of the coordination. He will be speaking about QVF as well. It won't be the full fledge training that we will be doing here. But it will be an introduction to it. Hopefully that will fit nicely with the overall goal of the workshop.

XI. County/Local Projects and Activities

Rosemary Anger (Barry County), We finally, after 2 ½ years got our 911 vender off of PC Arc based system and onto a Arc 8 system and we are implementing that tomorrow morning. We should only have to version it once a month. There are three projects – the County Road update, 2004 Land use cover update and self promote and self produce our plat book. We have done two Plat books already with two different venders and it seem to pay the 1st time, but the second time we sent PDF's and they altered the font. So all the work that we had done on the layout was totally flushed. So, we decided that this time we would do it ourselves.

Mark Larrow (Monroe County), They are in the process of updating the road map. We are trying to use the Framework as much as possible to add all of the updates that we can. We are trying to get a product back from the vendor that we can take and use to update the Framework. The county is talking about getting a GIS server. They have met with ESRI to see what all that is going to take. We are in that process right now.

Rob (CGI), do you have a time line on the Roadmap update? Months?

Mark (Monroe Co), we are looking at the end of February.

Jeroen (GVSU), Marquette County is also reworking their GIS. There is discussion where to put it at Equalization & Planning or at the Central dispatch. It looks like Planning will become the housekeeper of that function.

Rob (CGI), who is up there now, Bill Rowe?

Jeroen (GVSU), he is part of the Regional Planning Authority. This is Marquette County Planning. Al Finestein is head of that. Marquette itself is not big enough for a full time FDE for GIS, so it needs to be housed somewhere as an adjunct activity where it is still functional. Planning has the best tract record to keep on doing that. They are in the best position.

Rob (CGI), during that flood they provided some of the key information.

Rosemary (Barry County), I talked with Eric over in Eaton County. He is new. He will be producing a 2005 Plat Book. So, maybe someone will come up with Data sharing printing agreement for Multiple County Plat Book initiatives.

Bob Carra (Genesee County), I have only been with the County for a few weeks. We are currently using the Framework through out the County and various departments. They are looking at the possibility of developing our own road centerline file, but we are looking at different options. One might be to partner with CGI in someway to enhance the existing framework or potentially providing some sort of our data for spatial accuracy. That is something that I am trying to see what they are looking for.

Rob (CGI), so is there a working group, a stakeholders group coming together to decide things?

Bob (Genesee County), they have a GIS Steering Committee established for quite a while, also, a working group. Both committees meet on separate days once a month. GIS is established in 3 or 4 different departments and it's also in the Road Commission, Water & Waste. So, they've got quite an investment made already, but they need to bring it all together.

Rob (CGI), what will be your role? Are they advising your group? Or how does that work? Has that been established, yet?

Bob (Genesee County), Basically, a lot of the departments are going out and doing their own thing, so they wanted someone with expertise to come in and coordinate a lot of the efforts. They have a steering committee, but they don't have professional GIS leadership.

XII. Regional Projects and Activities

Ann Burns (SEMCOG), we have our next regional meeting a week from today and I have brought the agenda if anyone is interested. We are refocusing that group to be a technical GIS user group. So, we are going to try that new format a week from today. The topics that will be discussed are public safety and GIS. Aside from that we are spending a lot of time on flight agreements and our DBA got sent to SDE training with Oracle. These are open meetings for all to attend. If you need directions, it is on our Web site. Remember to bring your parking ticket in to be validated.

XIII. Federal Projects and Activities

Gordon Rector, United States Census Bureau (Census), The Census Bureau is starting up the American Community Survey, which will take the place of the long form Census questionnaire. Just this past week, Census finally got the money to launch that survey in early 2005. It has been running in a test mode for the last several years. Once it is fully implemented, communities will receive the kind of data that comes out from the long form questionnaire (sample data) at regular intervals. It will be much more current then getting the data every 10 years. It also has the potential to make the next Census simpler because it would just have the one form. The public release of the TIGER line file are suppose to be coming out this month. They were originally supposed to be out in October and that got delayed. We expect to see a lot of changes in Michigan Counties based on the Framework files that we received a couple of years ago. They will probably not be as accurate or current as Version 4, as we used Version 3 or Version 3b for the repositioning work.

XIV. Other Issues

XV. Next Meeting Date

January 6, 2005, 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., Michigan Center for Geographic Information,
George W. Romney Building, 111 S. Capitol, 10th Floor, Lansing, MI 48933